



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

*m*

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/431,566	10/29/1999	LAURENCE WAYNE CLARKSON	7000-044	8874

27820 7590 04/03/2007  
WITHROW & TERRANOVA, P.L.L.C.  
100 REGENCY FOREST DRIVE  
SUITE 160  
CARY, NC 27518

EXAMINER
----------

PHAM, HUNG Q

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2168

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	04/03/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/431,566

Applicant(s)

CLARKSON ET AL.

Examiner

HUNG Q. PHAM

Art Unit

2168

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 March 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 48-58 and 60-72 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 68 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 48-58, 60-67 and 69-72 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. <u>03/22/07</u>                             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application  |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                           |

## DETAILED ACTION

### **Response to Arguments**

#### Claim Objections

The objection with respect to the informalities has been withdrawn in view of the amendment of claims 49, 55, 56 and 68.

#### Duplicate Claims, Warning

- Applicants' arguments with respect to the warning of duplicate claims 56 and 68 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The warning of duplication of claims 56 and 68 has been withdrawn.

- Applicants' arguments with respect to the warning of duplicate claims 55 and 67 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As argued by applicants:

*... Indeed, a mere difference in scope between claims has been held to be enough." The Applicants submit that there is a difference in claim scope between claims 55, 56, 67, and 68 when compared to claims 49 and 62. For example, claim 55 recites the following: "add audio segments to the audio package in the centralized database," "delete audio segments from the audio package in the centralized database," and "lock the audio package in the centralized database." Claim 67 includes similar features, albeit in method format. The Applicants submit that these features are not recited in claims 49 and 62.*

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

The difference between claims 49 and 55 is the limitation *wherein said audio package builder/export tool is further configured to construct the audio package from audio segments in the centralized database by performing one or more of the following steps: add audio segments to the audio package in the centralized database; delete audio segments from the audio package in the centralized database; and lock the audio*

*package in the centralized database* of claim 55. However, this claimed limitation is just a slight difference in wording because the step of *constructing an audio package from audio segments* as recited in claim 49 implies *adding audio segments to the audio package in the centralized database*. The *audio package builder/export tool* of claim 49 does not need to perform the step of deleting or locking because the wherein clause of claim 55 indicates only one step is performed. Therefore, claim 55 is a substantial duplicate of claim 49 because they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

Applicants' arguments with respect to the rejection of claims 48-58, 71 and 72 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As argued by applicants:

*More specifically, the claims include both software and hardware. For example, each of the claims recites a gateway, which, as defined in the Specification, is an external device, such as hardware. Thus, the present claims recite both hardware and software, which, as the Patent Office points out, is statutory subject matter. As such, the Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn.*

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

The gateway as recited is *an external device* and is not part of the system as in claims 48-58, 71 and 72. Therefore, the rejection of claims 48-58, 71 and 72 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 is sustained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- Claim 49 has been amended. However, the clause *the audio segment* (lines 12-13) references to other items in the claim. It is unclear what item is being referenced. Therefore, the rejection of claim 49 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, is sustained.

Art Unit: 2168

- Claim 62 has been amended. However, the clause *the audio segment* (lines 8 and 9) references to other items in the claim. It is unclear what item is being referenced. Therefore, the rejection of claim 49 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, is sustained.

- The rejection of claims 55 and 67 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, has been withdrawn in view of the amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102 and 103

- Applicants' arguments with respect to the rejection of claims 48-54, 56-58, 60-66 and 68-72 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and 103 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection of claims 48-54, 56-58, 60-66 and 68-72 has been withdrawn.

- Applicants' arguments with respect to the rejection of claims 55 and 67 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As argued by applicants:

(1) ... *The Applicants respectfully submit that Cromwell does not disclose an index file that indicates to a gateway where an audio segment may be located in an audio package. In maintaining the rejection, the Patent Office indicated that an Announcement Server Package includes an event file. Furthermore, the Patent Office appears to equate the event file to an index file and appears to equate the Announcement Server Package with an audio package. While the Announcement Server Package does in fact include the event file, the Applicants respectfully submit that even if one were to somehow equate the event file with an index file and if one were to somehow equate the Announcement Server Package with an audio package, points which the Applicants are not conceding, the event file does not indicate to a gateway where an audio segment may be located in an audio package, as recited in claim 55. In fact, Cromwell does not disclose that the event file indicates the location of the Announcement Server Package.*

- (2) *Claim 55 also recites that the audio package is exported to a gateway. Claim 67 includes similar features, albeit in method format. The Applicants submit that Cromwell does not disclose exporting an audio package to a gateway. In maintaining the rejection, the Patent Office states that Cromwell discloses this feature at pages 12 and 13.5 The Applicants respectfully disagree. While the cited portions of Cromwell do disclose receiving return parameters in response to sent audio data, nowhere does Cromwell disclose that the audio data was exported to a gateway, as recited in claim 55. Therefore, for this reason and the reason noted above, Cromwell does not disclose all the features recited in claims 55 and 67 and the Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.*

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

- (1) As disclosed by Cromwell, MGCP Announcement Package is used in an Announcement Server Gateway and supports direct references to simple audio as well as indirect references to simple and complex audio (Page 1, Abstract, second paragraph). Announcement Server Package includes an Event File comprising of audio events, e.g., Play Announcement, Play Collect and Play Record, corresponding to particular parameters. A Play Announcement is to play an announcement where there is no need for interaction with the user. A Play Collect is to play a prompt and collect DTMF digits entered by a user. If no digits are entered the user may be re-prompted to enter a corrected pattern of digits. A Play Record is to play a prompt and record user speech (Pages 4-5, Section 3, Events). The Event File is supported by Parameters File (Page 6). Initial Prompt is an initial announcement prompting the user to enter DTMF digits or to speak. A Re-Prompt is played after the user has made an error. No Digits Re-Prompt is played after the user has failed to enter a valid digit pattern during a Play Collect event (Page 8). In view of this teaching, an Event File is a list of audio events to be played in an Announcement Server Gateway. When a call is received at the Announcement Server Gateway, and, for example, the call indicates a Play Collect event, initial prompt parameter is used for Initial Prompt for prompting the user to enter DTMF digits or to speak. A re-prompt parameter is used for playing Re-Prompt after the user has made an error. In different

Art Unit: 2168

words, the Cromwell teaching indicates *an index file, e.g., Event File, within the audio package, e.g., MGCP Announcement Package, that indicates to the gateway, e.g., Announcement Server Gateway, where in the audio package, e.g., MGCP Announcement Package, an audio segment may be located, e.g., Initial Prompt or Re-Prompt is located by a particular parameter.*

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., *Cromwell does not disclose that the event file indicates the location of the Announcement Server Package*) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

(2) As suggested by Cromwell, there are two methods of specifying complex audio. The first is to directly reference the individual components. The second method is to provision the components on the Announcement Server and to export that reference to the call agent (Page 4, Section 1, Introduction, Paragraph 2). The MGCP protocol defines a number of event packages for supporting a particular type of gateway functionality and controls a VOIP gateway from an external call agent (Page 1, Abstract, First and Second paragraph). Thus, under MGCP protocol, to export the audio to the call agent, the generated MGCP Announcement Package as discussed above must be carried from Announcement Server to the Announcement Server Gateway, e.g., VOIP gateway, and this feature is implied in the Cromwell teaching in order to export to the call agent. In different words, the Cromwell teaching implies *the audio package is exported to a gateway.*

***Duplicate Claims, Warning***

Applicant is advised that should claims 49 and 62 be found allowable, claims 55 and 67 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

**Claims 48-58, 71 and 72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.**

Claims 48-58, 71 and 72 are directed to a system that comprises software per se, e.g., *a centralized database comprising a plurality of audio segments, and an audio package builder/export tool.*

Software per se is not one of the four categories of invention. Software per se is not a series of steps or acts and thus is not a process. Software per se is not a physical article or object and as such is not a machine or manufacture. Software per se is not a combination of substances and therefore is not a composition of matter. Therefore claims 48-58, 71 and 72 are non-statutory.



***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

**Claims 48-54, 57, 58, 60-66 and 69-72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.**

Regarding claim 49, the clause *the audio segment* (lines 12-13) references to other items in the claim. It is unclear what item is being referenced. Dependent claims 48, 50, 51-54, 57, 58, 71 and 72 are also rejected at least by virtue of their dependencies from claim 49.

Regarding claim 62, the clause *the audio segment* (lines 8 and 9) references to other items in the claim. It is unclear what item is being referenced. Dependent claims 60, 61, 63-66, 69 and 70 are also rejected at least by virtue of their dependencies from claim 62.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

**Claims 55 and 67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Cromwell [A Syntax For the MGCP Audio Package].**

Regarding claims 55 and 67, Cromwell teaches *a system for use in a telecommunications network for providing audio segments to a gateway to be played to an end user of the telecommunications network* (As disclosed at pages 1 and 2, MGCP Announcement Package that includes Play Announcement, Play Collect and Play Record is constituted for use by an Announcement Server Gateway and an External Call Agent (page 1)), *said system comprising:*

*a centralized database comprising a plurality of audio segments, said audio segments comprising announcements to be played to the end user of the telecommunications network* (As disclosed at page 4, Introduction, paragraphs 1 and 2, a complex audio structure consists of an announcement followed by voice variable followed by another announcement, e.g., "There are thirty seven minutes remaining on your prepaid calling card", where the number of minutes is a voice variable. A complex audio could be specified by provisioning the components on the Announcement Server as a single reference. As seen, the Announcement Server as *a centralized database comprising a plurality of audio segments, said audio segments comprising announcements to be played to the end user of the telecommunications network*);

*an audio package builder/export tool configured to* (The syntax as disclosed is *an audio package builder/export tool*):

*access the centralized database* (As discussed above with respect to page 4, Introduction, Announcement Server as *the centralized database* is *accessed* to provision the announcement components by referencing);

*construct an audio package from audio segments in the centralized database* (As further disclosed at page 4, Introduction, paragraphs 3 and 4, an Announcement Server Package as *an audio package* is constructed from *audio segments* in Announcement Server);

*construct an index file within the audio package that indicates to the gateway where in the audio package an audio segment may be located* (As disclosed by Cromwell, MGCP Announcement Package is used in an Announcement Server Gateway and supports direct references to simple audio as well as indirect references to simple and complex audio (Page 1, Abstract, second paragraph). Announcement Server Package includes an Event File comprising of audio events, e.g., Play Announcement, Play Collect and Play Record, corresponding to particular parameters. A Play Announcement is to play an announcement where there is no need for interaction with the user. A Play Collect is to play a prompt and collect DTMF digits entered by a user. If no digits are entered the user may be re-prompted to enter a corrected pattern of digits. A Play Record is to play a prompt and record user speech (Pages 4-5, Section 3, Events). The Event File is supported by Parameters File (Page 6). Initial Prompt is an initial announcement prompting the user to enter DTMF digits or to speak. A Re-Prompt is played after the user has made an error. No Digits Re-Prompt is played after the user has failed to enter a valid digit pattern during a Play Collect event (Page 8). In view of this teaching, an Event File is a list of audio events to be played in an Announcement Server Gateway. When a call is received at the Announcement Server Gateway, and, for example, the call indicates a Play Collect event, initial prompt parameter is used for Initial Prompt for prompting the user to enter DTMF digits or to speak. A re-prompt parameter is used for playing Re-Prompt after the user has made an error. In different words, the Cromwell teaching indicates *an index file, e.g., Event File, within the audio package, e.g., MGCP Announcement Package, that indicates to the gateway, e.g., Announcement Server Gateway, where in the audio package, e.g., MGCP Announcement Package, an audio segment may be located, e.g., Initial Prompt or Re-Prompt is located by a particular parameter); and*

*export the audio package to the gateway* (As suggested by Cromwell, there are two methods of specifying complex audio. The first is to directly reference the individual components. The

Art Unit: 2168

second method is to provision the components on the Announcement Server and to export that reference to the call agent (Page 4, Section 1, Introduction, Paragraph 2). The MGCP protocol defines a number of event packages for supporting a particular type of gateway functionality and controls a VOIP gateway from an external call agent (Page 1, Abstract, First and Second paragraph). Thus, under MGCP protocol, to export the audio to the call agent, the generated MGCP Announcement Package as discussed above must be carried from Announcement Server to the Announcement Server Gateway, e.g., VOIP gateway, in order to export to the call agent. In different words, the Cromwell teaching indicates *the audio package is exported to a gateway*;

*wherein said audio package builder/export tool is further configured to construct an audio package from audio segments in the centralized database by performing one or more of the following steps: add audio segments to the audio package; delete audio segments from the audio package; and lock the audio package* (Page 6, a provisioned segment is added to Announcement Server Package).

#### **Allowable Subject Matter**

- **Claim 68 is allowed.**

However, as recited in the preamble is the process of *providing audio segments to a gateway*. The step of *exporting the audio package to the gateway* should end the process of *providing audio segments*. Therefore, the step of tracking should be rewritten with a wherein clause. Claim 68 has been drafted by the examiner as below for reviewing. The examiner respectfully suggests the applicants rewriting claim 68.

- **Claims 48-54, 56-58, 60-66 and 69-72 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, and 101 as set forth in this Office action.**

Art Unit: 2168

- The following claims drafted by the examiner and considered to distinguish patentably over the art of record in this application, are presented to applicant for consideration:

49. (Currently Amended) *A system for use in a telecommunications network for providing audio segments to a gateway to be played to an end user of the telecommunications network, said system comprising:*

*a provisioning server;*

*a centralized database containing a plurality of audio segments, said audio segments comprising announcements to be played to the end user of the telecommunications network;*

*an audio package builder/export tool executed by the provisioning server and configured to:*

*access the centralized database;*

*construct an audio package from audio segments in the centralized database;*

*construct an index file within the audio package that indicates to the gateway where an audio segment ~~may be~~ is located in the audio package; and*

*export the audio package to the gateway,*

*wherein the audio segment is located by using said index file ~~is configured to mapping~~ an the audio identifier of ~~the~~ an audio segment in the centralized database to ~~an the~~ offset and length of ~~the~~ an audio segment within the constructed audio package ~~in the centralized database~~.*

51. (Currently Amended) *The system of claim 49 wherein said system is configured to operate on ~~a~~ the provisioning server.*

53. (Currently Amended) *The system of claim 49 wherein said audio package builder/export tool is further configured to present a graphical user interface to a user such that the user ~~may~~ selects audio segments to be placed in the audio package.*

54. (Currently Amended) The system of claim 49 wherein the audio package further includes said an audio segments file comprises a subset of the audio segments in the centralized database.

56. (Currently Amended) A system for use in a telecommunications network for providing audio segments to a gateway to be played to an end user of the telecommunications network, said system comprising:

a provisioning server;

a centralized database containing a plurality of audio segments, said audio segments comprising announcements to be played to the end user of the telecommunications network;

an audio package builder/export tool executed by the provisioning server and configured to:

access the centralized database;

construct an audio package from audio segments in the centralized database;

construct an index file within the audio package that indicates to the gateway where an audio segment ~~may be~~ is located in the audio package; and

export the audio package to the gateway,

wherein the constructed audio package is associated with a version number and said audio package builder/export tool is further configured to track a version number of any audio package created with the audio package builder/export tool.

57. (Currently Amended) The system of claim 49 wherein said audio package builder/export tool is further configured to export the audio package to the gateway by preliminarily exporting the audio package to an intermediary storage location within ~~a~~ the provisioning server.

62. (Currently Amended) A method of providing audio segments to a gateway to be played to an end user of a telecommunications network, said method comprising:

accessing audio segments within a centralized database;

constructing an audio package from the accessed audio segments in the centralized database;

Art Unit: 2168

constructing an index file within the audio package that indicates to the gateway where in the audio package an audio segment ~~may be~~ is located;  
exporting the audio package to the gateway; ~~and~~,  
wherein the audio segment is located by using said index file for mapping an the audio identifier of the an audio segment in the centralized database to an the offset and length of the located audio segment within the audio package in the centralized database.

64. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 62 further comprising associating each of said audio segments with ~~a~~ an unique audio identifier.

65. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 62 further comprising presenting a graphical user interface to a user such that the user ~~may select~~ selects audio segments to be placed in the audio package.

66. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 62 wherein ~~constructing an audio package from audio segments in the centralized database comprises constructing an~~ the audio package is constructed from a subset of the audio segments in the centralized database.

68. (Currently Amended) A method of providing audio segments to a gateway to be played to an end user of a telecommunications network, said method comprising:

accessing audio segments within a centralized database;  
constructing an audio package from audio segments in the centralized database;  
constructing an index file within the audio package that indicates to the gateway where in the audio package an audio segment ~~may be~~ is located;  
exporting the audio package to the gateway; ~~and~~,  
wherein tracking a version number of any the constructed audio package constructed is associated with a version number and each audio package constructed is tracked by its own version number.

*71. (Currently Amended) The system of claim 49 wherein said audio package builder/export tool exports the audio package to the gateway so that the gateway ~~may~~ selectively presents the audio segments within the audio package to end users.*

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

Prior arts of record do not render obvious, nor anticipate the combination of claimed elements including *mapping the audio identifier of an audio segment in the centralized database to the offset and length of an audio segment within the constructed audio package and tracking a version number of any audio package created with the audio package builder/export tool* as recited in claims 49, 56, 62 and 68.

Dependent claims 48, 50-54, 57, 58, 60, 61, 63-66 and 69-72 are allowed at least by virtue of their dependencies from claims 49 and 62.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

### **Conclusion**

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after




Art Unit: 2168

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HUNG Q. PHAM whose telephone number is 571-272-4040. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, TIM T. VO can be reached on 571-272-3642. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

  
HUNG Q PHAM  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2168

March 22, 2007